

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 and 30-37 were pending. Claims 1-11, 13-18, and 30-37 were rejected. Claim 12 was objected to as allowable but depending from a rejected base claim. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and objections are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Amendments

Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15-18, 30, 33, and 37 have been amended in response to claim objections and claim rejections under §112, second paragraph, as listed on pages 2-3 of the Office Action dated November 14, 2007. No new matter has been added.

Claims 2 and 36 have been canceled without disclaimer or prejudice by way of this reply.

Claim 1 has been amended to include all the limitations of canceled claim 2.

Further, claim 1 has also been amended to include the limitation “...a server script running on a web server, the server script operative to request, and receive in response to the request, data information from a data information source...” No new matter has been added by way of this reply, as support for the amendment can be found throughout the specification, *e.g.*, paragraph [0045] and FIG. 3.

Furthermore, claim 1 has been amended with the limitation “wherein for each run of the loop, the server script sends requests for data information to the data information source.” No new matter has been added by way of this amendment, as support for the amendment can be found throughout the specification, *e.g.*, paragraph [0048], FIG. 3, and FIG. 4.

Claim 33 has been amended to include all of the limitations of canceled claim 36.

Objections to the Specification

The Abstract of the disclosure has been objected to because the abstract is written more than 150 words in length. Applicants have amended the Abstract to conform to the requirements detailed in MPEP § 608.01(b). Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is

respectfully requested.

The disclosure has been objected because the information cited under “Cross Reference to Related Application” section is not up to date. Applicants have amended this section to reflect updated cross-reference information. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 3 has been objected for depending on itself. Claim 3 has now been amended to depend from independent claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 31, and 33 have been objected with an advice to write the acronym “COM” in full form, for clarification. Applicants have amended claims 4, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 30, and 33 (Note that claim 31 depends from claim 30, which also includes the acronym “COM.”) accordingly. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 8, 16, 36, and 37 have been objected with an advice to write the acronym “URL” in full form, for clarification. Applicants have amended claims 7, 8, 16, and 37 accordingly. Claim 36 has been canceled. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 has been objected with an advice to write the acronym “ASP” in full form, for clarification. Applicants have amended claim 17 accordingly. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under § 112

Claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because of the term “can” included in the claim language. Applicants have amended claim 17 to now recite “...providing an updateable web page that [[can]] provides updates of rapidly changing...” Accordingly withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Claim 18 depends directly from claim 17, and withdrawal of this rejection with respect to claim 18 is also respectfully requested.

Rejections Under § 102

Claims 1-11, 13-18, and 30-37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,317,777 (hereinafter “Skarbo”). Claims 2 and 36 have been canceled by way of this reply, therefore the rejection with respect to claims 2 and 36 is now moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of remaining claims 1, 3-11, 13-18, 30-35, and 37.

Claim 1, 4-6, 9-11, 13-15

Claim 1 has been amended with the limitation of canceled original claim 2. To the extent that the rejection still applies to claim 1, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, now recites, in part, a server script running on a web server, the server script operative to requesting and, in response to the request, receiving data information from a data information source...wherein the server script runs in a loop, and wherein for each run of the loop, the server script sends requests for data information to the data information source. Applicants submit that Skarbo fails to teach or suggest that the web server requests the information source for information during each run of the loop, as required by claim 1.

In rejecting original claim 2, the Office Action asserts:

Re claim 2, Skarbo et al. further disclose in Figures 1-2 and 7-9 the server script runs in a loop (e.g. by Figures 5-6).”

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to indicate how the Figures 1-2 and Figures 6-9 are related to a server script running in a loop. Therefore, the Applicants’ arguments are directed to Figure 5 of Skarbo.

The Office Action asserts that Skarbo, in Figures 5, discloses that the server script runs in a loop. However, the step (reference 262) labeled “RECEIVED REQUEST?” in Figure 5 of Skarbo merely waits to receive further requests from the user. Specifically, the server of Skarbo in Figure 5, step 262, waits in the loop until it receives a request to add, remove, create, open/close, or download a file from the user (Skarbo, col. 8, lines 40-50).

Assuming that the Office Action considers the user (or the client computer) as the information source, the server of Skarbo, within the loop 262, in fact, only receives a request from the information source. Skarbo fails to teach that the server sends requests to the data information source for each run of the loop in step 262, as required by claim 1. This is further evident from Figure 5 of Skarbo, where the last communication sent by the server to the user (reference 260: “LIST STORED DOCUMENTS”), takes place before the loop at step 262. Because the step 260 is executed before—and therefore outside—the loop around step 262, the server of Skarbo fails to teach or suggest that requests are sent to the information source for each run of the loop.

Therefore, Skarbo fails to teach or suggest at least one limitation of claim 1 that requires that for each run of the loop, the server script sends requests for data information to the data information source. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Skarbo. Claims 4-6, 9-11, 13-15 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 3

Claim 3 has been rejected for being anticipated by Skarbo. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 directly depends from claim 1. As discussed above, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Skarbo. By virtue of its dependence, claim 3 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Further, Applicants submit that Skarbo fails to teach or suggest that the server loop keeps an on going connection between the web server and the client, as required by claim 3. This is clearly evident from Skarbo’s statement that it uses the hyper text transfer protocol (HTTP) in a configuration which does not allow “keep-alive or equivalent options” (Skarbo, col. 7 line 66-67). This is further evident from the fact that Skarbo uses “cookies” to link separate webpage download requests from the client (Skarbo col. 8, lines 1-10). Each separate webpage download request from the client establishes a new connection between the client and the server, and cannot be treated as an on-going connection. Therefore, claim

3 is patentable over Skarbo for this reason, as well. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 7

Claim 7 has been rejected for being anticipated by Skarbo. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 recites, in part, that the web browser running on the client computer device, in response to receiving a particular Universal Resource Locator (URL), downloads a monitoring web page from the web server, the monitoring web page defining a visible pane and an invisible pane. In rejecting claim 7, the Office Action asserts that the limitation of claim 7 is disclosed, by example, at col. 7 lines 1-10 and lines 25-35 of Skarbo. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Skarbo, col. 7, lines 1-10, discloses software that dynamically generates a HTML presentation of a document that the user wishes to upload to the document server. Skarbo also discloses that the creation of the HTML presentation occurs automatically in the background when the document is uploaded to the document server. First, regarding the software, Applicants submit that the software of Skarbo is not a web page. A software program is an executable file that may run as a background process on an operating system. On the other hand, a web page is a text file that is input to a web browser. Appropriate tags in the text file make the web page invisible to the viewer. The software of Skarbo, although running in the background, invisible to the user, is not a text file with appropriate tags that is inputted to a web browser. Therefore, the software of Skarbo is not an invisible pane of the web page, as required by claim 7. Further, claim 7 requires that the client computer download the monitoring web page, which includes a visible pane and an invisible pane. In contrast, the software of Skarbo is not downloaded from the server. The software resides on the user machine and is executed when the user selects an action button displayed on the webpage (Skarbo, col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 3).

Regarding the generation of HTML presentation, Applicants submit that the HTML presentation of Skarbo is generated from an existing document stored on the client computer—and not downloaded from the web server. The preparation of an HTML

presentation in the background converts a document into a HTML document. This HTML document is generated from a document residing on the client computer. Evidence supporting this statement is provided by Skarbo on col. 7, lines 1-10 in addition to lines 25-35 (*e.g.* “...creation of the HTML based presentation occurs automatically in the background when a document is uploaded to the document server”). Thus, the software executed by Skarbo in background is, in fact, directed to uploading the HTML presentation document to the document server. Uploading a document, or a HTML presentation thereof, cannot be equated to downloading a web page from a web server, as required by claim 7.

Therefore, Skarbo fails to teach or suggest downloading a monitoring web page from the web server, the monitoring web page defining a visible pane and an invisible pane, as required by claim 7. Thus, claim 7 is patentable over Skarbo. As discussed above, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Skarbo. Claim 7 depends, directly or indirectly from claim 1, and is patentable over Skarbo by virtue of this dependence as well. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 8

Claim 8 has been rejected for being anticipated by Skarbo. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 recites, in part, the web browser running on the client computer device, in response to receiving a particular Universal Resource Locator (URL), downloads a monitoring web page from the web server, the monitoring web page defining a visible pane and an invisible pane, the invisible pane receiving the client script, the visible pane being visible on the display of the client server and being updated via the client script. In rejecting claim 8, the Office Action asserts that the limitation of claim 8 is disclosed, by example, at col. 7 lines 1-10 and lines 25-35 of Skarbo. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As discussed above, with respect to claim 7, Skarbo fails to teach or suggest downloading a monitoring web page from the web server, the monitoring web page defining a visible pane and an invisible pane. Claim 8 also requires that the web browser running on the client computer downloads a monitoring web page from the web server, the

monitoring web page defining a visible pane and an invisible pane. Therefore, claim 8 is patentable over Skarbo.

Further, Skarbo fails to teach or suggest that the invisible pane receiving a client script, the visible pane being visible on the display of the client server and being updated via the client script, as required by claim 8. Instead, Skarbo discloses a software/process, running in the background, which converts a document, which the user wishes to upload to the document server, into an HTML presentation (Skarbo, col. 7, lines 6-8). Skarbo fails to teach or suggest that a client script is downloaded to an invisible pane. Furthermore, Skarbo fails to teach or suggest an updating of a visible pane by a script running on the invisible pane. Lacking an invisible pane and a script running on the invisible pane, no updating of a visible pane by a client script running on an invisible pane is possible in Skarbo. In fact, the background software/process of Skarbo is not even related to updating any information on the client computer. The background software/process of Skarbo merely converts a user selected document to an HTML based presentation. There is no teaching in Skarbo of an already existing monitoring web page that the software can update with the generated HTML based presentation.

Therefore, Skarbo fails to teach or suggest at least one limitation of claim 8, which recites that the web browser running on the client computer device, in response to receiving a particular Universal Resource Locator (URL), downloads a monitoring web page from the web server, the monitoring web page defining a visible pane and an invisible pane, the invisible pane receiving the client script, the visible pane being visible on the display of the client server and being updated via the client script. Thus, claim 8 is patentable over Skarbo. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 16

Claim 16 has been rejected for being anticipated by Skarbo. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 16 recites, in part, a processing unit, in conjunction with the web browser, being operative to receive the monitoring web page corresponding with the monitoring web page Universal Resource Locator (URL) via the web server interface, the monitoring web

page including an invisible pane and a visible pane, the invisible pane being operative to periodically receive a client script via the web server interface and to execute the client script. In rejecting claim 16, the Office Action asserts that Skarbo discloses receiving a monitoring webpage, the monitoring webpage including an invisible pane and a visible pane on col. 5, lines 1-5. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Skarbo, in col. 4, line 64 to col. 5, line 5 states:

Continuing now with FIG. 2, after initializing the document server 130, the next step is to initialize the conference installations 132 (e.g. attendees utilizing videoconferencing equipment 102 of FIG. 1). Typically, one of the conference installations corresponds to the presenter, unless the presenter's conference installation and the document server are implemented on the same computing device. Among other conference initialization operations, each participant connects to the document server and retrieves the working documents for the collaborative conference event.

Skarbo merely teaches that each participant connects to the document sever and retrieves the working documents for the collaborative conference event. Skarbo fails to teach or suggest that the working documents, retrieved by each participant, include a visible pane and an invisible pane. As shown in FIG. 3 of Skarbo, the document server includes various documents, listed in the file list 160, that are shared by the participants. These documents are uploaded and/or downloaded by the participants prior to and during the conference. Skarbo is completely silent regarding these documents (*e.g.*, AUDIO_WL.GIF, CM_PROP.PPT, *etc.*) serving as monitoring webpages. Furthermore, Skarbo is completely silent regarding the documents including an invisible pane and a visible pane.

Therefore, Skarbo fails to teach or suggest a processing unit downloading a monitoring webpage, the monitoring webpage including an invisible pane and a visible pane, as required by claim 16. Thus, claim 16 is patentable over Skarbo. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 and 18

Claim 17 has been rejected for being anticipated by Skarbo. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 17 recites, in part, a method comprising retrieving a monitoring web page from a web server, the monitoring web page defining a visible pane and an invisible pane. In rejecting claim 17, the Office Action asserts that the above recited limitation of claim 17 is disclosed by Skarbo at col. 3 lines 30-35, col. 6 lines 33-44, and col. 8 lines 40-58. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Col. 3 lines 30-35 of Skarbo discuss the implementation of a document sever using a combination of web page templates, extension DLLs and server scripts. Skarbo further discusses various technologies used by the document server to access data in a database. Skarbo is completely silent regarding a monitoring webpage defining an invisible pane and a visible pane. The web page templates (Skarbo FIG. 1B, reference 118) of Skarbo do not teach or suggest an invisible pane and a visible pane, as required by claim 17.

In col. 6 lines 33-44, Skarbo discloses the implementation of the document list object (Skarbo FIG. 4, reference 200) as a Java object or an Active-X object. The data file storing the document list is either embedded in the object or may be input to the object. This is completely unrelated to a monitoring web page having an invisible pane and a visible pane.

In col. 8, lines 40-58, Skarbo discloses the client server interaction while performing file operations on shared documents. The requests are handled through generation of HTML forms and/or Microsoft ASP forms. Here also, Skarbo fails to disclose that the generated HTML forms or web pages include an invisible pane and a visible pane as required by claim 17.

Therefore, Skarbo fails to teach at least one limitation of claim 17 that recites that the monitoring web page includes an invisible pane and a visible pane. Thus, claim 17 is patentable over Skarbo. Claim 18 depends from claim 17, and is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 17. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 30-32

Claim 30 has been rejected for being anticipated by Skarbo. Claim 30 has been amended to include the limitation that the monitoring web page including an invisible pane and a visible pane. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to claim 30, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above with respect to claims 7, 8, 16, and 17, Skarbo fails to teach or suggest a monitoring web page where the monitoring web page includes an invisible pane and a visible pane. Claim 30 also recites a monitoring web page, wherein the monitoring web page includes an invisible pane and a visible pane. Therefore, Skarbo fails to teach or suggest at least this one limitation of claim 30. Thus, claim 30 is patentable over Skarbo. Claims 31 and 32 depend directly from claim 30, and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 30. Accordingly withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 33-35, and 37

Claim 33 has been rejected for being anticipated by Skarbo. Claim 33 has been amended with all of the limitations of canceled claim 36. Specifically, claim 33 now includes the limitation “wherein the web browser running on the client computer device, in response to receiving a particular URL, downloads a monitoring web page from the web server, the monitoring web page defining a visible pane and an invisible pane.” To the extent that the rejection may still apply to amended claim 33, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above with respect to claims 7, 8, 16, and 17, Skarbo fails to teach or suggest a monitoring web page where the monitoring web page includes an invisible pane and a visible pane. Claim 33 also recites a monitoring web page, wherein the monitoring web page includes an invisible pane and a visible pane. Therefore, Skarbo fails to teach or suggest at least this one limitation of claim 33. Thus, claim 33 is patentable over Skarbo.

Claims 34, 35, and 37, depend directly from claim 33, and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 33. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that each of the pending claims is allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections and a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is therefore requested.

* * * * *

Respectfully submitted,

March 14, 2008

Date

/Raymond Scott Reese/

Raymond Scott Reese

Reg. No. 47,891

**WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH,
RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P.**
20333 State Highway 249, Suite 600
Houston, TX 77070

832/446-2400

832/446-2424 (facsimile)

wcpatent@counclip.com